

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,180	04/04/2005	Go Nagaya		5597
23373 SUGHRUE M	7590 06/17/200 HON PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSYL VANIA AVENUE, N.W.			VANAMAN, FRANK BENNETT	
SUITE 800 WASHINGTO	ON, DC 20037	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		3618	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/530,180	NAGAYA, GO		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Frank B. Vanaman	3618		
I falik D. Valialilali	3010		

	Frank B. Vanaman	3618	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 05 June 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
 N The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(I Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		26(a) and the annualist	a automolom for
Extensions of uniter injury be doubless united 37 CFR 1.136(q). The data have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in comp.	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	filed within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t They raise new issues that would require further cor They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belowed) 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all 		imely filed amendmen	at canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	owable ii subiliitted iii a separate, t	intery med amendmen	it canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) rejected to			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	I sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	I and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowan	ce because:
 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other: 	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Frank B Vanaman/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3618	

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: it is not persuavise in overcoming the rejection as set forth. Applicant's cainfrication that the previous argument that "a knuckle" (the use of the term 'a' undestood, as is commonly used, to refer to a singular element) being divided into two parts actually means that there are first and second knuckles (the use of the suffix 's' understood to refer to plural elements) is noted and the examiner appreciates applicant's calification on this place, the use of the suffix is somethin gof a logical inconsistency in the application of the language. As best understood, it appears as though applicant is attempting to assert that Baker et all fall to disclosed two knuckles. The examiner does not agree, as two elements which perform as knuckles to the breadth of applicant's claim recitations (applicant is reminded that it is the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim language which is compared to the prior arti. are taught in the reference to Baker et al. as has been articulated in the most event Final Office Action.